United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/31/MEX/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
24 August 2018
English
Original: English/Spanish

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirty-first session
5–16 November 2018

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Mexico*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 45 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints. A separate section is provided for the contribution by the national human rights institution that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles.

II. Information provided by the national human rights institution accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles

2. The National Human Rights Commission urged Mexico to ratify the Optional Protocols to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and to the Convention on the Rights of the Child; the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness; the International Labour Organization (ILO) Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189); and other regional treaties.[2]

3. The National Human Rights Commission was concerned that Mexico had not recognized the competence of the Committee on Enforced Disappearances to receive individual communications.[3]

4. The National Human Rights Commission noted that the prevalence of corruption perpetuated structural inequality, poverty, exclusion and violence and called for its prevention and punishment.[4]

5. The National Human Rights Commission stated that the bodies that were responsible for providing security were those that committed the greatest violations of personal security.[5]

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

GE.18-13935 (E) 300818 030918

1813935

Please recycle

6. The National Human Rights Commission has challenged the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act before the Supreme Court on account of the lack of legal certainty and the discretionary power of the authorities to allow the army to act.[6]

7. The National Human Rights Commission recommended gradually withdrawing soldiers from public security operations; improving the accusatorial criminal justice system; professionalizing the police force by means of a reform; and establishing an autonomous attorney general's office.[7]

8. The National Human Rights Commission stated that forced disappearance remained a structural problem within the institutional framework and the operation of State bodies, but it welcomed the approval of the General Act on Forced Disappearance, Disappearance Committed by Private Individuals and the National Search System and called for implementing regulations to be issued.[8]

9. The National Human Rights Commission noted that torture occurred immediately after a person's arrest, before the person was handed over to the competent authority, but that the General Act on the Prevention, Investigation and Punishment of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment had strengthened the national mechanism for the prevention of torture.[9]

10. The National Human Rights Commission called for preventive custody to be abolished and for the Code of Military Justice and the Military Code of Criminal Procedure to be aligned with international standards.[10]

11. The National Human Rights Commission reported that human rights violations continued to go unpunished, for example in the case involving 43 students of the rural teacher training college in Ayotzinapa, Guerrero and the case concerning Tlatlaya, Mexico State.[11]

12. The National Human Rights Commission stated that it was urgently necessary for government officials to recognize the work of human rights defenders and journalists; properly implement the Act on the Protection of Human Rights Defenders and Journalists; and strengthen the corresponding protection mechanism.[12]

13. The National Human Rights Commission called for the implementation of public policies designed to create a safe and respectful environment for journalists, the media and human rights defenders.[13]

14. The National Human Rights Commission noted that 82.9 per cent of human trafficking victims were women, that 39.8 per cent of them were under 18 years old and that there were still 10 states where exemptions and exceptions made it possible to marry a minor.[14]

15. The National Human Rights Commission is concerned about the lack of convictions in cases of sexual abuse and femicide, despite the General Act on Women's Access to a Life Free of Violence and the laws that are in place in all states.[15]

16. The National Human Rights Commission noted that the General Act on the Rights of Children and Adolescents marked a step forward but that it was concerned about the situation of children and adolescents, especially unaccompanied migrant children.[16]

17. The National Human Rights Commission reported that indigenous peoples remained in a precarious situation and asserted that prior and informed consultations should be held with communities that were affected by development projects and business operations.[17]

18. The National Human Rights Commission stated that the granting of constitutional recognition to the Afrodescendent population in Mexico should be treated as a priority.[18]

19. The National Human Rights Commission mentioned the need to rethink migration policy, placing greater emphasis on respect for human rights, and to promote the adoption of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration.[19]

20. The National Human Rights Commission expressed concerns about the situation of persons displaced by violence linked to organized crime, religious issues, megaprojects and natural phenomena.[20]

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations[21] and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[22]

21. Joint submission (JS) 15 and Advocates for Human Rights (AHR) recommended that Mexico should ratify the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.[23] JS15 recommended ratifying articles 31 and 32 of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.[24]

22. Save the Children noted that the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure was pending.[25]

23. The Federal District Human Rights Commission recommended ratifying the Inter-American Convention on Protecting the Human Rights of Older Persons and the Inter-American Convention against Racism, Racial Discrimination and Related Forms of Intolerance.[26]

24. International Centre for Trade Union Rights (ICTUR) recommended that Mexico ratify ILO Convention N° 98 on the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining (1949).[27]

B. National human rights framework[28]

25. With respect to recommendation 148.39,[29] JS7 reported that there were no specific mechanisms for follow-up to recommendations or indicators for the evaluation of measures at the federal level.[30]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination[31]

26. JS14 recognized developments such as specific protocols, anti-discrimination campaigns, the National Day to Combat Homophobia, national surveys on non-discrimination and dialogues with social organizations for the protection of the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons.[32] AHR noted that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex persons continued to experience discrimination, harassment and violence.[33]

27. JS14 recommended designing, budgeting for and establishing an official register of hate crimes against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons in Mexico.[34] AHR recommended that Mexico amend the Criminal Codes of all Mexican States so that crimes committed based on the victim's sexual orientation or gender identity are considered hate crimes.[35]

28. The Federal District Human Rights Commission reported that progress had been made in Mexico City, as it was now possible to request a new birth certificate based on gender identity and same-sex marriage had been legalized, although restrictive interpretations of the law prevented same-sex couples from registering their children and led to other forms of discrimination.[36]

Development, the environment, and business and human rights[37]

29. JS6 stated that structural impunity and the lack of compliance with business and human rights principles had specific impacts on groups in vulnerable situations, such as women, young persons, indigenous peoples, campesinos and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and intersex persons.[38]

30. JS6 recommended reviewing the legislation relating to the energy reform in order to incorporate clear provisions on improving the living conditions, work, health and education of indigenous peoples and campesinos.[39]

2. Civil and political rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person[40]

31. Fundación Vida (Life Foundation) reported that kidnapping was widespread, against a backdrop of violence, impunity and corruption.[41] J2 drew attention to the recurrent and widespread problem of hidden graves, which showed the challenges of protecting life.[42] International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) referred to the implications of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons for the right to life.[43]

32. Open Society Justice Initiative (OSJI) noted that the decade-long militarization strategy employed in Mexico's so-called "War on Drugs" had resulted in grave human rights violations by Mexican federal forces.[44] OSJI recommended that Mexico establish an international mechanism, composed of Mexican and international staff and based inside Mexico, with a mandate to independently investigate and, when necessary, prosecute atrocity crimes.[45]

33. Amnesty International (AI) stated that Congress had approved the law on "Interior Security" in December 2017. The law increased the role of the armed forces in public security and did not provide for adequate civilian control over the armed forces.[46] JS11 stated that the law also threatened freedoms of association and expression.[47] JS17 noted that the law established extremely vague definitions for internal security threats and assigned intelligence-gathering tasks to the armed forces. The Law was currently the subject of multiple constitutionality challenges before the Supreme Court.[48]

34. JS20 stated that the Government had been reluctant to accept that forced disappearance was a widespread problem.[49] AI noted that enforced disappearances with the involvement of State agents and disappearances by non-state actors continued to occur throughout Mexico. The whereabouts of 35,410 people remained unknown, according to the National Register of Missing and Disappeared Persons.[50] Human Rights Watch (HRW) stated that the Attorney General's Office had started 369 investigations into enforced disappearances but had not obtained any conviction.[51]

35. JS18 stated that the enforced disappearance of 43 students of Isidro Burgos teacher training college in Ayotzinapa, in September 2014, had revealed the extent of the human rights crisis and the macrocriminal context, acting as an urgent call to combat impunity. The technical assistance team set up by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights had identified flaws such as the failure to carry out a search immediately after the disappearance, the planting of evidence, the manipulation of chains of custody and the widespread use of torture during the investigation.[52]

36. AI noted that in October 2017, Congress had passed a general law on enforced disappearances and disappearances by non-state actors that defined the crime in accordance with international law and provided important tools to prevent and prosecute these crimes.[53] HRW added that the law still needed to be implemented.[54]

37. JS10 referred to torture as a common practice.[55] JS20 added that 95 per cent of cases of torture occurred during investigations and that the offence of torture went completely unpunished.[56]

38. The Center for Justice and International Law (CEJIL) stated that, although positive measures had been taken, such as the adoption of the General Act on the Prevention, Investigation and Punishment of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the establishment of a special unit for the investigation of torture within the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic and the promulgation of a new approved protocol for the investigation of torture, the application of these standards had not resulted in the effective prevention and punishment of torture.[57]

39. JS18 recommended ensuring that the provisions of the General Act on Forced Disappearance, Disappearance Committed by Private Individuals and the National Search

System and the General Act on the Prevention, Investigation and Punishment of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment were promptly incorporated into the legislation of all federative entities and effectively implemented, with sufficient funding and an open process of appointing special prosecutors.[58]

40. JS17 noted that the National Law on Execution of Criminal Judgments represented an advance for the penitentiary system and for ensuring that the execution of criminal judgments was guided by the principal of reinsertion in society.[59] The Federal District Human Rights Commission referred to violations of the rights of detainees in Mexico City.[60]

41. AHR noted although the "*arraigo*" was designed specifically to combat organized crime, it had been criticized for being used by the authorities to coerce confessions from suspects under torture.[61] JS20 stated that preventive custody of this kind was a form of arbitrary detention that lasted up to 80 days.[62]

42. JS10 reported that teachers in Oaxaca who had opposed the education reform had been arbitrarily detained.[63]

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[64]

43. JS18 reported that the Code of Military Justice had been amended in 2014 to establish, for the first time, a restriction on military jurisdiction in cases of human rights violations against civilians.[65] JS20 added that it had not been possible to strip military courts of their jurisdiction over cases of human rights violations against members of the military.[66] AI recommended that Mexico amend the Code of Military Justice to ensure that all allegations of human rights violations committed by members of the armed forces, irrespective of the civilian or military character of the victim, are properly investigated, prosecuted and tried exclusively by civilian judicial authorities.[67]

44. JS17 documented hundreds of cases, showing that Mexico's criminal justice system suffered from corruption and collusion with criminal groups, was excessively bureaucratic, and lacked independence, professionalism and accountability mechanisms.[68]

45. JS20 reported that prosecutors constantly sought to avoid prosecuting public officials by obstructing proceedings and that the reclassification of offences, the practice of concealing or tampering with evidence, the lack of independent forensic services and the lack of judicial independence had contributed to the serious crisis of impunity.[69]

46. JS11 stated in February 2014, Mexico had amended its Constitution to allow the creation of a new Fiscalía General de la República, one with autonomy from the executive branch and an independent budget; however, Congress had yet to carry out additional constitutional and legal reforms.[70] JS20 and AHR recommended establishing an autonomous and independent attorney general's office, with its own budget for conducting impartial investigations.[71]

47. JS17 noted that the new adversarial criminal justice system represented an unprecedented advance in the design and normative framework of criminal procedure, but due to insufficient will and capacity within prosecutors' offices to adjust their practices, the last few years had seen public calls for counter-reforms.[72] AHR stated that the new adversarial justice system had replicated old problems.[73]

48. JS20 reported that impunity in Mexico was widespread and was the cause and consequence of the serious crimes that were committed there.[74] JS21 noted that the overall rate of impunity for attacks on journalists was over 99 per cent, which served to only encourage a cycle of violence.[75] JS20 recommended setting up an additional international mechanism to combat impunity, under the auspices of the United Nations.[76]

49. JS6 noted the existence of the Executive Commission for Victim Support but asserted that some of the measures taken by that institution harmed and victimized people further.[77]

50. JS12 noted that a constitutional reform created a National Anticorruption Agency and provided for the creation of 32 Anticorruption Systems at the State level. Nineteen States complied with these new obligations, while 11 others almost completed the

necessary steps to do so; however, most of the necessary legislative work was still pending in Chihuahua and Tlaxcala.[78]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[79]

51. JS8 was concerned that impunity and the lack of protection for religious leaders continued to have a negative impact on the right to freedom of religion or belief. It stated that between November 2013 and February 2018, 27 religious leaders were killed.[80] ADF International and European Centre for Law and Justice (ECLJ) noted that the persecution against Christians came from organised criminal organisations and cartels.[81]

52. JS9 noted that no progress had been made towards media pluralism, despite the approval of the Federal Telecommunications and Broadcasting Act in 2014.[82] CS recommended that Mexico implement Telecommunications Law Article 89 in consultation with indigenous media practitioners.[83] JS21 stated that the Transparency and Access to Information Law, was world leading in the legal protection, but shortcomings had remained in its implementation.[84]

53. JS21 noted that while the Federal Constitution protected freedom of expression and information, provisions in many states' criminal codes remained incompatible with international human rights law, and were routinely relied upon to criminalize the work of journalists and undermined the public's right to know using, for instance, provisions on defamation, calumny and insult of state officials.[85]

54. JS17 noted that from 2012–2017, at least 41 journalists and 110 human rights defenders were murdered.[86] International Centre for Trade Union Rights (ICTUR) reported on the killing of trade unionists.[87] AI stated that impunity persisted for most cases as allegations of harassment and other attacks were not properly investigated.[88]

55. Association for Progressive Communications (APC) had found that women such as feminists, journalists, sexual rights activists and women human rights defenders who were in the public eye were more likely to be subject to online gender based violence, identifying six tendencies in this regard.[89]

56. JS6 noted that community and indigenous leaders and human rights defenders involved in proceedings concerning lands and territories were particularly vulnerable, as they faced persecution by the State and the private sector.[90]

57. JS9, JS10 and Taula per Mèxic (Table for Mexico) referred to the murder of human rights defenders and indigenous and community leaders, in Guerrero, Oaxaca, Chiapas and Veracruz in particular.[91] JS18 referred to the situation in Guerrero,[92] while the Federal District Human Rights Commission referred to the situation in Mexico City.[93]

58. Reporters Without Borders (RSF-RWB) noted that in 2017 alone, no fewer than 11 journalists were killed in Mexico. Those mainly responsible for such attacks and threats were law enforcement officials and politicians, drug cartels and criminal gangs.[94]

59. JS9 referred to cases of journalists whose homes or offices had been raided and who had been arrested arbitrarily, physically assaulted, kidnapped, tortured or killed for covering issues linked to local politics, corruption, violence committed by the security forces, organized crime and drug trafficking.[95]

60. JS9 noted that the work of civil society was hindered by the Government's illegal surveillance of journalists, human rights defenders, organizations and activists, using spyware called Pegasus, which was developed by NSO Group.[96]

61. JS9 stated that the establishment of a protection mechanism for human rights defenders and journalists was certainly a step forward but the effectiveness of that mechanism was limited by implementation problems.[97] AI highlighted the establishment of a special unit on prevention, monitoring and analysis, training for its personnel, and the evaluation of the protection measures provided.[98] JS15 reported that the mechanism had maintained a constant dialogue with civil society.[99]

62. JS21 noted that the Protection Mechanism's budget had been drastically reduced, undermining its ability to provide effective assistance to the Mechanism's Prevention,

Monitoring and Analysis Unit's work.[100] JS7 mentioned obstacles relating to resource management; human resources; investigation, prevention and evaluation; and impunity.[101]

Prohibition of all forms of slavery[102]

63. Comisión Unidos contra la Trata (United Against Human Trafficking Commission) (CUvT) noted that, although legislation on human trafficking had been passed, the offence continued to be overlooked, there were few convictions and not only was there corruption but the authorities were also unaware of the legislation.[103]

64. JS4 reported that the Programme to Combat Trafficking in Persons had focused on providing information for prevention purposes and ensuring that the authorities fulfilled their obligations in the fields of prevention and victim support; however, the dissemination of information and other preventive measures in schools remained insufficient.[104]

65. JS4 reported that, in areas that were popular with tourists and border areas, children suffered exploitation and were particularly vulnerable to human trafficking.[105]

Right to privacy and family life[106]

66. APC stressed that Mexico was part of the core group leading resolutions on the right to privacy in the digital age at the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly.[107] AccessNow informed that in 2017 Mexico had enacted the Federal Law of Protection of Personal Data in the Possession of Private Parties in order to protect individuals' personal data.[108] JS21 noted that Federal Law had become an instrument of online censorship.[109] JS21 recommended that Mexico reform the Federal Law on the Protection of Personal Data Held by Private Parties and the General Data Protection Law for Obligated Entities, in order to include an explicit exception limiting the right to cancel and to oppose, where the information is in the public interest.[110]

67. JS16 reported on the inadequate regulation of communications surveillance, illegal and unchecked surveillance, the purchase and irregular use of surveillance malware, spying on journalists and the lack of investigations.[111] JS16 recommended adopting legislation and carrying out the necessary reforms in order to ensure that surveillance tools were purchased and used in a way that was legal, necessary, proportional and respectful of human rights.[112]

68. Save the Children and JS12 recommended aligning the legal frameworks of all the federative entities with the General Act on the Rights of Children and Adolescents so as to establish 18 years old as the minimum age for marriage, without exemptions or exceptions.[113]

69. JS14 recommended amending article 4 of the Constitution on the right to a family by removing the references to men and women in order to ensure the recognition of marriage between any persons, regardless of sex or gender.[114]

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work[115]

70. ICTUR recommend that Mexico continue the process of law reform to give workers greater democratic control over their representation at the workplace.[116]

71. JS4 reported that indigenous persons suffered discrimination when they travelled around the city in search of work.[117]

Right to social security[118]

72. The Federal District Human Rights Commission stated that, in Mexico City, police officers worked tirelessly for insufficient pay and without any guarantee of social security.[119]

Right to an adequate standard of living[120]

73. JS23 noted that Mexico faced numerous challenges to ensuring the human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation to all.[121]

Right to health[122]

74. JS19 raised concerns about the dismantling and gradual privatization of the health sector and noted that the first step in that direction had been the progressive dismantling of the Mexican Social Security Institute and the Institute of Social Security and Social Services for State Employees.[123]

75. The Mexican Foundation for Family Planning (MEXFAM) stated that abortion was legal throughout the country (32 federative entities) if the pregnancy was the result of rape; however, it was permitted in only 29 federative entities in cases where the pregnancy placed the mother's life at risk, in 10 federative entities in cases where the pregnancy posed a severe risk to the mother's health and in 13 federative entities in cases where a congenital malformation had been identified.[124] MEXFAM recommended that the criminal codes of all federative entities should guarantee access to abortion at least on grounds of health; in cases of rape; in cases where the mother's life was at risk; and on socioeconomic grounds or grounds of social deprivation.[125]

76. JS7 noted that the law on conscientious objection would be a step backwards in cases where abortion had been legalized.[126] In this issue, ADF International encouraged Mexico to guarantee the right to conscientious objection.[127]

77. JS13 reported that Mexico had the highest rate of child obesity and the second highest rate of adult obesity in the world, which had led to the declaration of a public health emergency.[128] JS13 also raised concerns relating to the labelling of food and drink, and advertising aimed at children.[129]

78. Fundación Interamericana del Corazón (Inter-American Heart Foundation) (FICMX) referred to the problem of smoking and the issues of tobacco advertising and taxation, and called for amendments to the General Act on Tobacco Control.[130]

79. Treatment Action Group (TAG) recommended that Mexico align national tuberculosis programs with international standards ensuring access to the highest available standards, particularly in diagnosis, treatment and prevention.[131]

80. The Federal District Human Rights Commission stated that public health institutions in Mexico City were not structurally equipped to cater for 8 million inhabitants.[132]

Right to education[133]

81. JS19 noted that there was a trend towards the privatization of education and that the costs of public education were increasingly being shouldered by families.[134]

82. JS4 noted that the new education model of 2017 focused on the development of indigenous and migrant communities; however, there were still significant shortcomings in teacher training, which hindered the provision of quality education with due regard for cultural diversity.[135]

83. JS19 asserted that multigrade indigenous and mainstream primary schools lacked teaching materials and that teachers were not properly trained.[136] JS4 reported that one fifth of indigenous children between 3 and 17 years old did not attend school and one tenth were not in the appropriate grade.[137] JS4 noted that access to education was severely affected by the lack of birth registration, especially in indigenous areas and the most remote areas of the country.[138]

84. JS3 recommended improving school infrastructure and increasing the budget and the teacher training provided in order to ensure the effective inclusion of persons with disabilities.[139]

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women[140]

85. With regard to recommendation 148.23,[141] JS7 reported that some state and local laws had not yet been aligned with the General Act on Women's Access to a Life Free of Violence, 10 years after its adoption.[142] MEXFAM recommended incorporating sexual and

reproductive rights into the General Act on Women's Access to a Life Free of Violence, as a cross-cutting theme.[143]

86. With respect to recommendation 148.68,[144] JS7 commented positively on the 2014–2018 Comprehensive Programme to Prevent, Address, Punish and Eradicate Violence against Women, which was in accordance with the Constitution, the Planning Act and the General Act on Women's Access to a Life Free of Violence.[145]

87. JS4 noted that a warning mechanism to protect women from gender-based violence had been launched in January 2018, pursuant to the General Act on Women's Access to a Life Free of Violence; however, the situation remained very serious.[146] Several organizations mentioned that violence against women was an ongoing problem.[147]

88. The Federal District Human Rights Commission stated that Mexico City was the entity with the highest level of violence against women,[148] while JS10 reported on the rise in femicidal violence in Oaxaca, indicating that 475 femicides had been committed between 2013 and 2017.[149]

Children[150]

89. JS3 and Save the Children noted that improvements had been made to the legal and institutional frameworks to ensure respect for the rights of children and adolescents, such as the introduction of the General Act on the Rights of Children and Adolescents and the National System for the Comprehensive Protection of Children and Adolescents, but that federal and local legislation had not been brought into line with the General Act on the Rights of Children and Adolescents.[151] JS10 noted that the National System for the Comprehensive Protection of Children and Adolescents did not have a budget or a clear programme of work.[152]

90. Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) noted that the General Law on the Rights of Children and Adolescents enacted in 2014 mentioned corporal punishment, but it did not explicitly repealed the "right of correction".[153]

GIEACPC and Save the Children recommended ensuring that corporal and psychological punishment were explicitly prohibited in the General Act on the Rights of Children and Adolescents and in the civil and family codes of the 32 federative entities.[154]

91. JS12 referred extensively to the sexual exploitation of children, including exploitation of children in prostitution; online child sexual exploitation; child sexual exploitation materials, trafficking of children for sexual purposes; sexual exploitation of children in the context of travel and tourism and child, early and forced marriage.[155] JS12 recommended that Mexico establish dedicated units in the law enforcement and prosecution offices that address sexual exploitation of children at the Federal level and in all States.[156]

Persons with disabilities[157]

92. The Federal District Human Rights Commission noted that the legal capacity of persons with disabilities was not recognized and that legal incompetence and interdiction proceedings were still provided for in local and federal civil legislation.[158]

93. JS4 recommended continuing to adopt the necessary measures to raise public awareness of the rights of persons with disabilities.[159]

Minorities and indigenous peoples[160]

94. Cultural Survival (CS) noted that Mexico had not obtained Indigenous Peoples' Free, Prior and Informed Consent regarding land usage, and the disregard for indigenous rights to land, with major projects implemented without consultation.[161] JS15 and CS recommended taking steps to ensure respect for rights relating to consultation and free, prior and informed consent.[162]

95. JS10 reported that there had been an increase in violations against indigenous peoples in Oaxaca as a result of energy and extraction projects and the creation of the special economic area in the Isthmus of Tehuantepec.[163] The Federal District Human Rights Commission referred to the situation of indigenous persons in Mexico City and the need to

adopt secondary legislation on access to justice, means of subsistence and the effective protection of their property rights.[164]

96. JS1 noted that constitutional recognition had been granted to the Afro-Mexican population in the states of Guerrero and Oaxaca and, more recently, in Mexico City and Veracruz and recommended making further progress in that regard at the federal and local levels and establishing an institution to support Afro-Mexican peoples and communities.[165]

97. JS1 recommended including specific programmes and budgets for the promotion of the rights of Afro-Mexican women in the operating rules of the National Institute for Women.[166]

98. The Federal District Human Rights Commission stated that persons of African descent accounted for 1.8 per cent of the population of Mexico City and had historically suffered marginalization and discrimination.[167]

Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons[168]

99. Clínica Internacional de Derechos Humanos (International Human Rights Clinic) (CUCSH) noted that the number of detentions had increased exponentially after the approval of the 2014–2018 Special Migration Programme.[169] JS17 noted that Mexico had enacted the Special Program on Migration; nonetheless, migrants and individuals falling under the scope of international protection continued to suffer systematic and systemic rights violations.[170]

100. JS17 noted that the program, which had truly shaped migration policy, was the Integral Program to Attend to the Southern Border, which had militarized the southeast of the country.[171]

101. CUCSH commented on the challenges of coordination between the migration and welfare authorities and their impact on the protection of the rights of migrant children.[172] CUCSH recommended expanding and improving the network of units and shelters at the national level.[173]

102. JS5 stated that the amendment to article 11 of the Constitution and the Act on Refugees, Complementary Protection and Political Asylum had not been properly implemented.[174]

103. JS5 reported that asylum seekers were still frequently detained and that it was difficult for them to gain access to a lawyer or an interpreter once they had been taken to a detention centre.[175] JS14 referred to the challenges faced by lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender migrants and asylum seekers.[176]

104. JS5 reported problems relating to access to refugee status recognition procedures and access to interpreters, and problems with the decisions of the Mexican Commission for Aid to Refugees.[177] JS3 stated that it was still common for child asylum seekers to be detained.[178]

105. JS20 stated that one of the consequences of the serious crisis of impunity and violence was forced internal displacement, which had affected at least 310,527 people.[179] JS17 referred to the impact of forced internal displacement in at least 12 federative entities.[180] JS18 recommended adopting effective measures to address the problem of forced displacement and gathering official data.[181] Save the Children recommended drawing up regional public policies on internal displacement and mechanisms to protect child and adolescent migrants travelling through the northern triangle of Central America and Mexico.[182]

Notes

[1] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org. (One asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with "A" status).

Individual submissions

AccessNow	AccessNow (United States of America);
ADF International	ADF International (Switzerland);
AHR	Advocates for Human Rights (United States of America);
AI	Amnesty International (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
APC	Association for Progressive Communications (South Africa);
CDHDF	Comisión de Derechos Humanos del Distrito Federal (México);
CEJIL	Centro por la Justicia y el Derecho Internacional (United States of America);
CS	Cultural Survival (United States of America);
CUCSH	Clínica Internacional de Derechos Humanos (México);
CUVT	Comisión Unidos contra la Trata AC (México);
ECLJ	European Centre for Law and Justice (France);
FICMX	Fundación Interamericana del Corazón (Mexico);
Fundación Vida	Fundacion Vida Grupo Ecologico Verde (Spain);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
HRW	Human Rights Watch (Switzerland);
ICAN	International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (Switzerland);
ICTUR	International Centre for Trade Union Rights (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
MEXFAM	Fundación Mexicana para la Planificación Familiar A.C (México);
OSJI	Open Society Justice Initiative (United States of America);
RSF-RWB	Reporters Without Borders International (France);
Save the Children	Save the Children Mexico (Mexico);
TAG	Treatment Action Group (United States of America);
Taula Per Mexic	Asociacion por la Paz y los Derechos Humanos Taula per Mexic (Spain).

Joint submissions:

JS1	**Joint submission 1 submitted by**: Fundación Afromexicana Petra Morga, A.C., Mano amiga de la costa chica, A.C., Presente y Cambio, Ciudadania Activa MX, Proyecto Ascendencia México, A.C., Red de Mujeres Guerreras Afromexicanas, Unidad para el Progreso de Oaxaca, A.C (México);
JS2	**Joint submission 2 submitted by**: Programa de Derechos Humanos de la Universidad Iberoamericana, Ciudad de Mexico-Tijuana, Programa Institucional de Derechos Humanos y Paz del Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Occidente, Instituto de Derechos Humanos "Ignacio Ellacuría, SJ" de la Universidad Iberoamericana, Puebla, Programa de Derechos Humanos y Educación para la Paz de la Universidad Iberoamericana, Torreón, Instituto Superior Intercultural Ayuuk. **Organizaciones**: Data Cívica, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Artículo 19 (Mexico);
JS3	**Joint submission 3 submitted by**: Fundación Marista por la Solidaridad Internacional, FMSI, Oficina Internacional Católica de la Infancia, BICE, Dominicans for Justice and Peace, Educando en los Derechos y la Solidaridad, EducaDyS, Centro de Apoyo Marista al Migrante, CAMMI, Colectivo de Organizaciones e Instituciones por los Derechos de la Infancia en Jalisco, Centro de Derechos Humanos Fray Francisco de Vitoria, FM4 Paso Libre, Centro de Derechos Humanos Fray Matías de Córdova, Voces Mesoamericanas, Red de Documentación de las Organizaciones Defensoras de Migrantes Foro Socioambiental de Guadalajara (Mexico);
JS4	**Joint submission 4 submitted by**: IIMA- Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice;

VIDES International – International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education, Development (Switzerland);

JS5 **Joint submission 5 submitted by**: American Friends Service Committee, Asylum Access México, Centro de Derechos Humanos Fray Matías de Córdova, A.C.; Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos; Casa del Migrante de Saltillo — Frontera con Justicia, A.C.; Programa Casa Refugiados, A.C.; Sin Fronteras, I.A.P.; Coalición Internacional contra la Detención (IDC, siglas en inglés); (México);

JS6 **Joint submission 6 submitted by**: Centro de Derechos Humanos "Fray Francisco de Vitoria OP", A.C. y la Asociación Dominicans for Justice and Peace (Order of Preachers). (Switzerland);

JS7 **Joint submission 7 submitted by**: Musas de Metal Grupo de Mujeres Gay A.C. y Sexual Rights Initiative (Argentina);

JS8 **Joint submission 8 submitted by**: Christian Solidarity Worldwide (CSW) and Impulso18. (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);

JS9 **Joint submission 9 submitted by**: CIVICUS: Alianza Mundial para la Participación Ciudadana y Frente por la Libertad de Expresión y la Protesta Social (South Africa);

JS10 **Joint submission 10 submitted by**: Consorcio para el diálogo Parlamentario y la equidad Oaxaca A.C. Comité de Defensa Integral de los Derechos Humanos Gobixha A.C. Espiral por la Vida A.C. Servicios para una Educación Alternativa A.C. (Mexico);

JS11 **Joint submission 11 submitted by**: Center for Justice and International Law (CEJIL), the Due Process of Law Foundation (DPLF), the German Network for Human Rights in Mexico, Latin America Working Group (LAWG), the Open Society Justice Initiative (OSJI), Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights, the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA), and the World Organisation Against Torture (OMCT). (United States of America);

JS12 **Joint submission 12 submitted by**: ECPAT Mexico with ECPAT International (Thailand);

JS13 **Joint submission 13 submitted by**: El Poder del Consumidor A.C., Semillas de Vida A.C., Proyecto Alimente A.C., FIAN Internacional, Sección México, The Hunger Project México (México);

JS14 **Joint submission 14 submitted by**: Fundación Arcoiris por el Respeto a la Diversidad Sexual, A.C. Las Reinas Chulas Cabaret y Derechos Humanos, A.C. Closet de Sor Juana A.C. Almas Cautivas A.C. Letra S, Sida, Cultura y Vida Cotidiana A.C. Asociación Internacional de Lesbianas Gays, Bisexuales, Trans e Intersex, Sección América Latina. ILGA-LAC Asociación Internacional de Lesbianas Gays, Bisexuales, Trans e Intersex. ILGA World. (México);

JS15 **Joint submission 15 submitted by**: Peace Brigades Internacional PBI México and Coordinadora Alemana por los derechos humanos en México (México);

JS16 **Joint submission 16 submitted by**: La Red en Defensa de los Derechos Digitales (R3D) y Privacy International (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);

JS17 **Joint submission 17 submitted by**: 1. Artículo 19 2. Asistencia Legal por los Derechos Humanos (Asilegal) 3. Casa del Migrante Saltillo (CMS) 4. Centro de Derechos Humanos "Fray Bartolomé de Las Casas" 5. Centro de Derechos Humanos "Fray Francisco de Vitoria O.P" 6. Centro de Derechos Humanos "Fray Matías de Córdova" 7. Centro de Derechos Humanos "Miguel Agustín Pro Juárez" (Centro

Prodh) 8. Centro de Derechos Humanos de la Montaña, Tlachinollan 9. Centro de Derechos Humanos de las Mujeres (Cedehm) 10. Centro de Investigación y Capacitación Propuesta Cívica 11. Centro de Justicia para la Paz y el Desarrollo 12. Centro de los Derechos del Migrante (CDM) 13. Centro Diocesano para los Derechos Humanos "Fray Juan de Larios" 14. Centro Mexicano de Derecho Ambiental (Cemda) 15. Ciudadanos en Apoyo a los Derechos Humanos (Cadhac) 16. Colectivo contra la Tortura y la Impunidad (CCTI) 17. Comisión Ciudadana de Derechos Humanos del Noroeste 18. Comisión Mexicana de Defensa Y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos (CMDPDH) 19. Comité Cristiano de Solidaridad Monseñor Romero 20. Comité de Defensa Integral de Derechos Humanos Gobixha (Código DH) 21. Coordinadora Nacional Agua para Todxs Agua para la Vida 22. Documenta, Análisis y Acción para la Justicia Social 23. Efecto Útil. Centro de Monitoreo sobre Organismos Públicos de Derechos Humanos 24. Estancia del Migrante González y Martínez 25. Frente Cívico Tonalteco 26. Fundación para la Justicia y el Estado Democrático de Derecho 27. Fundar, Centro de Análisis e Investigación 28. Idemo, Iniciativas para el Desarrollo de la Mujer Oaxaqueña 29. I(dh)eas, Litigio Estratégico en Derechos Humanos 30. Instituto de Derechos Humanos Ignacio Ellacuría, S.J. Universidad Iberoamericana-Puebla 31. Instituto Mexicano de Derechos Humanos y Democracia (IMDHD) 32. Los Comuneros de Tezontepec de Aldama Hidalgo 33. Proyecto de Derechos Económicos, Sociales y Culturales (Prodesc) 34. Proyecto sobre Organización, Desarrollo, Educación e Investigación (PODER) 35. Red Balance Promoción para el Desarrollo y Juventud AC 36. Red Jesuita con Migrantes México 37. Red por los Derechos de la Infancia en México (REDIM) 38. Respuesta Alternativa, A. C. Servicio de Derechos Humanos y Desarrollo Comunitario 39. Serapaz, Servicios y Asesoría para la Paz 40. Sin Fronteras, IAP 41. Voces Mesoamericanas. Acción con Pueblos Migrantes AC Espacio de Coordinación de Organizaciones Civiles sobre Derechos Económicos, Sociales, Culturales y Ambientales (Espacio DESC) Redes: 1. Red Nacional de Organismos Civiles de Derechos Humanos "Todos los Derechos para Todas y Todos" (conformada por 84 organizaciones en 23 estados de la República mexicana); 2. La REDODEM: Red de Organizaciones Defensoras de Personas Migrantes; 3. Grupo de Trabajo de Políticas Migratoria; y 4. Espacio OSC. (México);

JS18 **Joint submission 18 submitted by**: Regional Center for the Defense of Human Rights "José María Morelos y Pavón" Center for Human Rights of the Mountain "Tlachinollan" (México);

JS19 **Joint submission 19 submitted by**: Red Nacional de Derechos Humanos; Consejo Nacional para la Defensa del Derecho Humano a la Salud; Comité de base de derechos humanos Digna Ochoa de Chiapas; Liga Mexicana para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos-Filial Region Sureste (México);

JS20 **Joint submission 20 submitted by**: Comisión Mexicana De Defensa Y Promoción De Derechos Humanos, Organización Mundial Contra la Tortura; International Federation for Human Rights (FIDH); I(dh)eas, Litigio Estratégico en Derechos Humanos. (México);

JS21 **Joint submission 21 submitted by**: ARTICLE 19, Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ) and PEN International (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);

JS22 **Joint submission 22 submitted by**: Friends of The African Union Global Solutions Center (FAU); New Future Foundation, Inc. (NFF); Projects of LIFE Lara (United States of America).

National human rights institution

CNDH La Comision Nacional de Derechos Humanos, (Mexico).

[2] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 9.
[3] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 4.
[4] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 3.
[5] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 3.
[6] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 6.
[7] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 6.
[8] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 4.
[9] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 4.
[10] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 5.
[11] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 3.
[12] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 5.
[13] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 6.
[14] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 8.
[15] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 6.
[16] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 8.
[17] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 7.
[18] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 7.
[19] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 8.
[20] CNDH, contribución al Examen Periódico Universal, Mexico, Mexico 2018, Tercer ciclo, p. 8.
[21] The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to ICESCR;
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;
ICCPR-OP 1	Optional Protocol to ICCPR;
ICCPR-OP 2	Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty;
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
OP-CEDAW	Optional Protocol to CEDAW;
CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT;
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child;
OP-CRC-AC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict;
OP-CRC-SC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography;
OP-CRC-IC	Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure;
ICRMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families;
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities;
OP-CRPD	Optional Protocol to CRPD;
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

[22] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, paras. 148.1–148.10.
[23] JS15, p. 6 and AHR, p. 1.
[24] JS15, p. 6.
[25] Save the Children, p. 1.
[26] CDHDF, pp. 4–5.
[27] ICTUR, p. 5.
[28] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, paras. 148.11–148.16, 148.28–148.35, 148.38–148.39, 148.101.
[29] See A/HRC/25/7, para. 148.39 (Colombia).
[30] JS7, p. 2.

[31] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, paras. 148.21, 148.39, 148.41, 148.146.
[32] JS14, p. 2.
[33] AHR, p. 4.
[34] JS14, p. 9.
[35] AHR, p. 5.
[36] CDHDF, p. 5.
[37] For relevant recommendation see A/HRC/25/7, para. 148.108.
[38] JS6, p. 5.
[39] JS6, p. 7.
[40] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, paras. 148.19–148.20, 148.48–148.62, 148.65, 148.90–148.91, 148.97, 148.102.
[41] Fundación Vida, pp. 2–5.
[42] J2, pp. 2–6. See also JS20, p. 9.
[43] ICAN, p. 1.
[44] OSJI, p. 1.
[45] OSJI, p. 3.
[46] AI, p. 3.
[47] JS11, p. 2.
[48] JS17, p. 2. See also CDHDF (p.6), CEJIL (p.2), OSJI, p. 3, Taula Per Mexic, p. 1, JS6, p. 4, JS7, p. 1, JS9, p. 14, JS15, p. 3, JS18, p. 4, JS20, p. 5, JS21, p. 1.
[49] JS20, p. 7.
[50] AI, p. 5. See also Taula Per Mexic, p. 3, JS10, p. 8, JS11, p. 6, JS17, p. 2, JS19, pp. 11–12.
[51] HRW, p. 3.
[52] JS18, p. 7. See also AI, p. 5, CS, p. 2, ICTUR, p. 4, OSJI, p. 6, JS9, p. 8, JS15, p. 2, JS16, p. 10, JS17, p. 6.
[53] AI, p. 3 See also JS18, pp. 3–4.
[54] HRW, p. 3. See also JS18, pp. 3–4.
[55] JS10, p. 8.
[56] JS20, P.9. See also AI, pp. 3–4, CDHDF, p. 5.
[57] CEJIL, p. 3. See also: JS10, p. 9, JS17, p. 1, JS18, pp. 3–4, JS20, p. 10, AI, pp. 3–4, HRW, p2.
[58] JS18, p. 4.
[59] JS17, p. 2.
[60] CDHDF, p. 2.
[61] AHR, p. 2. See also AI, pp. 3–4.
[62] JS20, p. 5.
[63] JS10, pp. 6–8.
[64] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, paras. 148.17–148.18, 148.63–148.64, 148.92–14.96, 148.99–148.100, 148.103–148.109, 148.111–148.113, 148.137.
[65] JS18, p. 4.
[66] JS20, p. 4.
[67] AI, p. 3. See also: CEJIL, pp. 4–5; JS18, p. 4.
[68] JS17, p. 5.
[69] JS20, p. 3. See also JS21, p. 6.
[70] JS11, p. 4. See also: JS17, p. 8.
[71] JS20, p. 12 and AHR, p. 5.
[72] JS17, p. 5. See also: JS21, p. 1.
[73] AHR, p. 3 See also AI, pp. 3–4, JS18, P.6.
[74] JS20, p. 3. See also JS15, p. 2, JS17, p. 2.
[75] JS21, p. 5.
[76] JS20, p. 12.
[77] JS6, p. 2.
[78] JS12, p. 8.
[79] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, paras. 148.22, 148.115–148.136.
[80] JS8, p. 3.
[81] ADF International, pp. 1–2 and ECLJ, pp. 2–4.
[82] JS9, p. 11.
[83] CS, p. 6.
[84] JS21, p. 10.
[85] JS21, p. 2.
[86] JS17, p. 5. See also CEJIL, p. 5.
[87] ICTUR, pp. 1–4.
[88] AI, p. 5. See also: JS21, p. 5.
[89] APC, pp. 4–6.

[90] JS6, p. 3. See also JS15, p. 5; JS21, p. 6; CS, p. 1.
[91] JS9, p. 7; JS10, pp. 3–4; Taula Per Mexic, p. 4.
[92] JS18, p. 8.
[93] CDHDF, p. 1.
[94] RSF-RWB, pp. 1–3. See also JS21, p. 4.
[95] JS9, pp. 9–11. See also RSF-RWB, pp. 1–3; JS9, p. 10; OSJI, p. 1; JS10, pp. 10–11.
[96] JS9, p. 4. See also JS16, pp. 7–10; JS21, p. 7; AccessNow, p. 2; JS11, p. 7; AI, p. 6.
[97] JS9, p. 6. See also AI, p. 6; JS15, p. 4; JS21, p. 4; RSF-RWB, p. 2; CEJIL, p. 6; JS6, p. 3; JS9, p. 17; CS, p. 4.
[98] AI, p. 6.
[99] JS15, p. 4.
[100] JS21, p. 4.
[101] JS7, pp. 7–9. See also AI, p. 6; JS15, p. 4; JS21, p. 4; RSF-RWB, p. 2; CEJIL, p. 6; JS6, p. 3; JS9, p. 17; CS, p. 4.
[102] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, paras. 148.25, 148.84–148.89.
[103] CUvT, pp. 9–10.
[104] JS4, pp. 6–8. See also JS12, p. 6.
[105] JS4, p. 4.
[106] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, para. 148.114.
[107] APC, p. 3.
[108] AccessNow, p. 1.
[109] JS21, p. 3.
[110] JS21, p. 3.
[111] JS16, pp. 3–12.
[112] JS16, p. 13.
[113] Save the Children, p. 3 y JS12, p. 5.
[114] JS14, p. 7.
[115] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, para. 148.139.
[116] ICTUR, p. 6.
[117] JS4, p. 3.
[118] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, para. 148.149.
[119] CDHDF, p. 8.
[120] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, paras. 148.26; 148.140–148.152.
[121] JS23, p. 6.
[122] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, paras. 148.153–148.157.
[123] JS19, pp. 3–4.
[124] MEXFAM, p. 3.
[125] MEXFAM, pp. 3–5. See also JS7, pp. 10–11.
[126] JS7, pp. 10–11.
[127] ADF International, pp. 3–5.
[128] JS13, p. 6.
[129] JS13, p. 16.
[130] FICMX, pp. 4–11.
[131] TAG, p. 9.
[132] CDHDF, p. 7.
[133] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, paras. 148.36; 148.158–148.163.
[134] JS19, p. 11.
[135] JS4, p. 6.
[136] JS19, p. 7.
[137] JS4, p. 5.
[138] JS4, p. 5.
[139] JS3, p. 3.
[140] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, paras. 148.23–148.24; 148.40; 148.42–148.47; 148.66–148.80; 148.138–148.139.
[141] See A/HRC/25/7, para. 148.23 (Spain).
[142] JS7, p. 1.
[143] MEXFAM, p. 5.
[144] See A/HRC/25/7, para. 148.68 (Brazil).
[145] JS7, p. 4.
[146] JS4, pp. 10–11.
[147] See APC, pp. 2–3; AHR, p. 4; JS3, pp. 7–8; JS6, p. 4; JS7, pp. 3–5; JS17, p. 7.
[148] CDHDF, p. 1.
[149] JS10, pp. 15–16.

[150] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, paras. 148.37, 148.81–148.83, 148.110.
[151] JS3, p. 2 y Save the Children, p. 1. See also JS12, pp. 4–5; J17, p. 1; JS3, p. 2; Save the Children, p. 1.
[152] JS10, p. 15.
[153] GIEACPC, p. 1.
[154] GIEACPC, pp. 1–2 y Save the Children, p. 2.
[155] JS12, pp. 1–10.
[156] JS12, p. 9.
[157] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, paras. 148.27, 148.164–148.165.
[158] CDHDF, p. 3.
[159] JS4, p. 12.
[160] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, paras. 148.166–148.172.
[161] CS, p. 5.
[162] JS15, p. 6 y CS, p. 6. See also JS3, p. 9; JS18, p. 6.
[163] JS10, p. 12.
[164] CDHDF, p. 3.
[165] JS1, pp. 4–8.
[166] JS1, p. 9.
[167] CDHDF, p. 5.
[168] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/7, paras. 148.173–148.176.
[169] CUCSH, p. 2.
[170] JS17, p. 1.
[171] JS17, p. 1. See also JS5, pp. 7–8.
[172] CUCSH, pp. 1–4.
[173] CUSCH, p. 8.
[174] JS5, p. 6.
[175] JS5, pp. 10–11.
[176] JS14, pp. 10 11.
[177] JS5, p. 6.
[178] JS3, p. 6. See also JS5, pp. 7–8; Save the Children, p. 4.
[179] JS20, p. 2.
[180] JS17, p. 6.
[181] JS18, p. 9.
[182] Save the Children, p. 4.